

economic writers and academic economists have swallowed this hypothesis whole without checking it by separate objective research and analysis: *testibus* Messrs. Douglas Jay, Anthony Crosland, and most socialist economists *pushum et repetitum*, Right and Left, in books, articles and speeches. Nowhere has such uncritical ingestion been more willing and complete than in Britain, where its effects on the economy have been disastrous, prolonged and are now at their peak.

Yet Mr. Beed's article and his references show that this popular Berle and Means hypothesis is, and was, wildly wide of the mark; that the nineteenth-century entrepreneur often had "sleeping partner" shareholders backing him and without control (shades of Boulton and Watt, George Stephenson, Brunel, *et al*); that both majorities and minorities of shareholders in modern companies frequently change the managements (especially more recently through dissatisfied institutional shareholders who stop in); and that mergers, bigness, &c., far from being beyond competition (shades of G.M. and Ford cars, P. & G.'s and Unilever's detergents, to say nothing of the British Electricity and Gas Boards, or British Railways and B.E.A.) and far from fixing prices and production and profits, *a priori*, lead rather to intensified competition, price-cutting and losses due to failure to meet the market's requirements.

Professor Galbraith sometimes lapses into sound and sensible disagreement with Berle and Means and with British party-political economists; as when he denies that labour unions have any real power over a modern economy to make it grow (they can wreck it, of course, but Professor Galbraith seems to be uninterested in growth anyway). But then he goes on arguing, from American experience, that shareholders, the electorate and the unions have no control over corporations (language and experience in his latest book are surprising and limitedly American) whose lives go on in the hands of the self-financing, self-perpetuating, modern,

technological, trained, salaried, managerial elite. "Top management today is independent not only of the firm's own shareholders, but increasingly of the capitalist as a whole," Crosland, *A. The Future of Socialism*, London, 1956. (This reads oddly in the Britain of 1967, with its state-stimulated mergers, state controls, new restrictions on management, and vast institutional capitalism for smaller investors). But overwhelmingly this ex-Canadian seer of *The New Industrial State* victimates and pontificates about "the affluent society", "the modern corporation", "private affluence amid public squalor", and other themes of his B.B.C. lectures, all of which, of course, have become contemporary Anglo-American myths and slogans; and he omits the whole evidence.

It is, like others of his books, highly selective. He fails to point out that, even if shareholders cannot control or change the new managerial elite running their property, in Britain (where "the public sector" this year takes or controls 50 per cent of the national income) the boards of our innumerable state and public bodies, services and agencies are under even less supervision and control by their owners (the public, Parliament, or local authority) than any big or small private enterprise's directors are by theirs. He does not note, still less emphasize, that much so-called "institutional investment" is indirectly (e.g., through investment trusts and clubs, unit trusts, pension funds, insurance companies, &c.) voluntary and involuntary individuals' saving and investment *at one remove*; and that in many cases the individuals concerned can, and do, back out if dissatisfied. Here let Professor G. C. Allen, a distinguished British critic of Professor Galbraith's B.B.C. lectures—a man versed in the structures of industry and companies not only in Britain, Europe and America, but also in Japan—be heard in evidence quite as justifiably critical of Professor Galbraith's new book as of his B.B.C. lectures, against which it was originally given: But a controversialist is never justified in

presenting an idiosyncratic interpretation of orthodox doctrine in order to give force to his own arguments. It is not permissible to set up Aunt Sallies. Professor Galbraith's expository methods at times violated this principle, and in consequence his lectures, while full of interest and fire, were at some points misleading. He may be faulted on two counts. First, he put forward as if they were novel and heretical various propositions about industrial society which have been accepted as commonplace by many economists for several decades. A minor consequence of this method of argument is that laymen who heard Professor Galbraith were liable to be given a distorted view of the typical economist's analysis of contemporary industrial tendencies. Secondly, by concentrating his attention on certain (admittedly very important) trends in the economies of Western countries and by neglecting other trends, he necessarily presented an incomplete and even distorted picture of those economies and of their operation. In other words, he made out that economists have inexcusably neglected developments that were patent to anyone who kept his eyes open, and he then proceeded to demolish what he exhibited as the accepted analysis of economic reality. Just as Berle and Means have never statistically or with any other objective and scientific data been able to verify, or even quantify, their thirty-five-year-old hypothesis, so Professor Galbraith fails to do so with that same hypothesis and a score of others which amount to *ipse dixit*, believe-you-me, declarations. Beed concludes on Berle's and Means'—and all their uncritically unquestioning followers—hypothesis about a growing separation of ownership from control: Were the limitations of the Berle-type method and results sufficiently in the minds of its users to preclude *non-sequitur* conclusions about reality, no argument need be made. Generally such is not the case and it has been the concern of this article to demonstrate the lack of adherence to the principles of the scientific method in the works of its chief exponent. Professor Galbraith also errs repeatedly in this way. There is an extraordinary lack of knowledge about modern business management in his—and most contemporary British economists'—

writings and talkings. Lord Robbins, who should know, remarked not long ago: "The contemporary teaching of economics fails conspicuously to convey the vivid realities of business. What a pitifully inadequate picture is given in the textbooks of the rich and varied life which is business in the twentieth century." Professor Galbraith sins in bad but numerous company. Not so Ricardo, Mill, Jevons, Marshall, Keynes. Not so even Marx, Engels, Veblen and Henry George.

What makes so many of our contemporary economists, Professor Galbraith not least, so confuse day-to-day "admin." with "control"? Or with management as a whole (Galbraith treats it as salaried and self-perpetuating)? Or with the overall supervisory functions of the board? The managerial salariat today becomes less and less unitary. Have Professor Galbraith and his followers not yet heard of "slimming the middle of management"? Let them ask Shell, I.C.I., Unilever and hundreds of others here—or any big American corporation. Have they not even yet observed the tussles between institutional shareholders, rival advisory merchant banks and rival boards in "take-overs" and the resultant cut-throat competitive bids for every small shareholder's few votes? Have they not yet noted the thumping losses made by competing British manufacturers of durable (especially electrical) household goods, who mis-assessed the market reactions of consumers? Have they not yet noted the inconsistency of the Left and all the so-called "common marketeers" in calling from one side of their mouths for a stronger blowing gale of competition through British industry (attendant upon our entry), and in simultaneously calling out of the other side of their mouth for more state intervention to buttress or shield on public funds this, that, or the other declining industry and its trade unions, like coal, shipbuilding, cotton, railways, and perhaps soon iron and steel, paper and board, machine tools, bulk chemicals, synthetic fibres, &c.

Galbraith now talks about trade unions' weakening membership and power (in America of course). This comes oddly from the phrasemaker who recently invented "the theory of countervailing power" exemplified by unions against bosses. Even odder is his apparent unawareness of the vastly enhanced power of both blue- and white-collar unions in controlling and preventing faster growth of the British economy these past fifteen years. (The unions in Britain today stand virtually beyond control by all the courts of the land, whereof Parliament is but one.) True, total membership of unions affiliated to the Trades Union Congress has slightly fallen very recently, mainly because of increased unemployment. Yet membership of all trade unions known to the Registrar of such associations has steadily risen with the transition to more white-collar than blue-dungaree jobs and with the proliferation of new occupational and para-professional or quasi-professional occupations and their associations. Nowhere has the process of party-politicising the study of economics wrought more grievous, economic, social, and above all intellectual harm than in Britain. The sudden afflux of many academic economists, overwhelmingly of one political outlook (and mainly selected therefore), to Whitehall in 1964-65; the overall effects of their works and counsels; and in the last few months their equally sudden efflux—this is a plot experiment of which, to judge by his new book and his B.B.C. talks, Professor Galbraith approves (though perhaps not of their efflux). But the overall results have been disastrous to private business, confidence, new productive investment, "The National Plan", launched and scuttled within nine months, is a byword and reproach. While the Prime Minister and two other Ministers, after three years of certain academic economists' counsels, "take over" the economy with the "last-minute urgency of a classic (university) Department of Economic Affairs, the National Economic Development Council and all the "little Noddies" of industry after industry, the T.U.C. and C.B.I., and all the other omnipotent and powerful bodies of state planning, or even more so-called Galbraithian "countervailing power", more than 50,000 extra

full-time public servants, the greatest growth of any sector of employment in three years, testify to part, but not all, of another of Galbraith's hypotheses, that private enterprise and "the public sector" have become more dovetailed. They have certainly done so in Britain these past three years, and especially the last three years. But where is the public affluence? Where is the growth we need through, the dynamic society, the new national and social solidarity? The British laboratory experiment has failed the Galbraithian tests, although the Galbraithian tests, although the public sector accounts for less than the U.K. national income as a whole, only 25 per cent (even with the Vietnam war) of the much more voracious, private enterprise, monopoly and free-market-capitalist American national income. British society these past three years, and for the past 15 since the last wartime controls and rationing went, has been far from affluent, despite the encroachment of all branches of the public sector on the private sector. But public squalor has not given way, as a Galbraithian should have expected after such state inroads, to public affluence, amenity and aesthetics. On the contrary, the services rendered by many, if not servants cost relatively more for lower qualities than they did five or ten years ago: from education to health Service, from public surface transport to the mails, from local authority street cleaning and other services to policing, law enforcement and public procurement in general. This is one of the strident weaknesses in Professor Galbraith's book: the argument from an American particular to a human universal. It is equally illogical to try to link his preference for "Stalin" (*Etatisme, dirigisme*) as against private enterprise and relatively free markets by pleading the experience of Britons (even more of Russians) in aid. Yet one is entitled to point out that in advanced countries where the state intervenes least—certainly Switzerland, the United States, Western Germany, even Sweden (where the state owns and "produces" far less than does the British public sector)—there are remarkable evidences of private provision for public amenity, benevolence, and removal of squalor. Professor Galbraith goes too far in his "scandalous" aversion from "the shame of the cities": his American cities. We may be Americanised in the superficialities of British and American life; but it is only in the *folly*, candy-floss, even criminal and smoking, surface; a minority and life. Just as the soft West is still observable before you reach Reading, a day's horse-ride and half an hour in today's train from London (and so all over Britain) still despite the B.B.C. accent, television, &c., &c., so in the profound depths of a modern affluent society's economy, things are seldom what they seem on the surface.

Another Galbraithian weakness—in fact and in argument—is shared by many publicists and politicians, particularly publicist-politicians in Britain who have never worked at any kind of private enterprise; never had to plan how to meet a Friday payroll; never had to learn how to make a big investment of other people's money, here and now "in their face" and pay for itself by satisfying consumers through production and marketing over years to come; but who, *ergo*, domineeringly and privately enterprise, still-private-profit, and who hate what they do not know. That weakness of some "big" characterisation of some "big" then apply these to the universe of the private sector as a whole, with the exception the rule. Professor Allen, in his paper *Economic Policy and Fantasy*, quoted earlier, shows how false were some of Professor Galbraith's assertions, particularly when applied to British private enterprise as a whole. With facts and figures, Professor Allen demolishes the Galbraithian economy of the vast number of small, specialised, up-to-date firms making good products for export and managing enterprises in the huge disintegrations in the management of the member firms of the small minority of big concerns.

And will Du nicht mein Bruder sein? So schlag' Ich Dir den Scheitel ein. We are back in the old, old argument about what is, and what is not, "productive" labour and capital: what should be socially permissible in an economy and what not; not, as hitherto, what is against common law and what is not. From standard education to standard personal earnings and spending and standard products is but a step. In, and immediately after, the siege-economy of war we called such standardized, stereotyped qualities "Utility". Professor Galbraith would appear to want Americans to move towards a more centrally state-planned, yet aesthetic and amenity-preserving, standardizing, stereotyping and simpler "Utility" economy. We in Britain could demonstrate that we have moved much farther and faster towards that goal than any other Western nation. We are nearer it now than the Russians, who have for some time been moving faster and farther than we have away from it. But once again, where is the growth in public affluence, the growth in public amenity and services, the wider public aesthetic, the closer-knit social solidarity, the erect national bearing and the clear national gaze? *Facilis descensus Avernus*. Professor Galbraith's non-potable Scotch ancestors warned him. So did his teacher: Old Tommy had learned that reasonable and equal laws when applied to individuals in unequal situations can have a highly unequal and wholly indefensible effect which, since the laws are reasonable, will usually go unnoticed. It is the definition of justice in Aristotle and in the Code of Justinian and has never been bettered since.

There is a strange psycho-political process in our era by which, lacking any transcendental religion, most Left-of-centre party-politicians and party-political-economists become dogmatically conscience-ridden if privileged by social origin and education, and as aggressively fanatical against all who disagree with them as the orthodox Church Fathers were against heretics (cf. Tertullian, *De Praescritioe Haereticorum*, *De Idolatria*, and *De Spectaculis*). Professor Galbraith writes of "the affluent society" in America (with little regard for Europe); Labour Party spokesmen and some of their academic economic counsellors in Britain speak and write of the "candy-floss economy"; and they do so like divine or self-appointed prophets calling the clocked to repentance. Who says? Much better written, much deeper penetrating, much more reasoned than Galbraith's latest *opus* is Dr. E. J. Mishan's *The Costs of Economic Growth* noticed in the *TLS* of June 15 last. The argument that material blessings and material increase are not the sum of human life is as old as the story of Christ and the rich young man who kept the Law in all things. (Looking upon whom, Jesus "loved him".) And three generations ago it was still being emphasized by Jerome K. Jerome: "... you would be happier earning five hundred a year than you ever will be earning two thousand ... we are all of us entitled to payment according to our market value, neither more nor less. You can take it all in cash. I used to. Or you can take less cash and more fun: that is what I am getting now. Economics has never claimed to cover "the whole duty of man": not even his ends; only the inescapable implications and conditions of his means to his ends when such means are limited as compared with the competing uses for them, and consequently bid-for by competing would-be users. As was said recently in these columns: We might all be happier if as consumers we demanded less from our economy of resources, and thus from the mass of the occupied population and (especially) from the minority of our leaders engaged in a rat-race. But Dr. Mishan's recent persuasive, documented and very able argument against mere "growth worship" ... and for a radical reconsideration of British society's priorities, is unlikely to have more than the *quicks of dust* which it merits.

Professor Galbraith also, in an Addendum to his work, contrasts the so-called social sciences with those of "nature", to the damage of the former, as though this too were something new. Nassau Senior noticed it in his distinction between pure and applied science. They seek a city of their own, perhaps not made with hands. They disapprove of affluent economic systems. They dislike what many, if not most, of their present fellow-citizens want, or are happy with. They increasingly rely on oratory, rhetoric, suasion, faith, dogmas. They evangelize. They keep their own eyes, and point all others on the stars. They look at the socio-political ends, not the (more sordid but inescapable) economic means. *Superbia tellus sidera donat*, as Boethius wrote from his dungeon; but Theodorice's minions strangled him, all the same. Nothing is wrong, morally or politically, with all this, and least of all in democracies. (As "new-speak" in authoritarian states it is "quite another thing".) But one wrong conclusion would be that it was economic theory or applied economics, enunciated with scrupulous scientific regard for nought else but economics, means and not ends, costs and competitive bids for scarce resources available for illimitable human ends. Another wrong conclusion would be that, as human ends persuasively put forward by these polemicists, they are easily, swiftly and cheaply realizable in any advanced or backward society. In an editorial in the *TLS* on September 7 occurred the following: As several contributors to *The Intellectual in Politics* point out, he is bound to be disappointed if he expects immediate results ... in terms of Dr. Mehnert's metaphor, he must be content to be a long-range weather forecaster. If he has not the patience to accept this limitation on his activity, he had best abstain from politics, and if he abstains, he had best abstain completely. Few things could be more dangerous than the intellectual politician in a hurry. Professor Galbraith—and many British intellectual politicians in a hurry (many of them trained or advised by academic economists in even more of a political hurry)—might note that the bold and hot Tertullian wrote *De Patientia* and *De Pudicitia*, on patience and modesty; but that none the less the universal church disowned him for impatience and arrogance as well as heresy.

Rhodesia
The Road to Rebellion
JAMES BARBER
The author analyses the origins of this tragically divided society and its relations with the rest of Southern Africa, and gives a detailed account of the political developments since 1960 which culminated in U.D.I. 2 plates, 1 map 42s net
Institute of Race Relations

African Integration and Disintegration
Case Studies in Economic and Political Union
Edited by ARTHUR HAZLEWOOD
The first detailed analysis of the experiences and problems of economic and political integration in the various regions of tropical Africa. The author has been economic adviser to both the Nyasaland and the Kenya Governments. 9 maps, 1 chart, 75s net
Chattem House

The Zande Trickster
Edited by E. B. EVANS, FRITCHARD
This collection of stories is prefaced by a brief, general account of the Zande way of life so that they may be read against their social and cultural background; and by a discussion of the main features of the tales, their content, structure, and meaning. 3 plates 42s net
Oxford Library of African Literature

The Law of Persons in the Later Roman Republic
ALAN WATSON
In this second to the author's *The Law of Obligations in the Later Roman Republic*, literary sources are extensively used and their interpretations of many of them are suggested. This volume is important not only for lawyers and social historians but for all who are interested in ancient Rome. 64s

Cornell Tacitus: De Vita Agricolae
Edited by R. M. COOPE and SIR IAN RICHMOND
This edition of one of the great works of Latin literature is intended to replace the older commentary by Purpur. It is a complete and up-to-date edition of the text, with a running commentary and notes on the text and on the life of Tacitus. 8 plates, 18 text figures 25s net

The Inequality of States
A Study of the Small Power in International Relations
DAVID VITAL
The first systematic attempt to consider the problems that face the small state in its external relations. These are discussed with particular reference to those whose position is most precarious—the neutral and unaligned states which either avoid the close protection of greater powers or are unable to obtain it. 30s net

The Conservative Tradition in America
ALLEN GUTTMANN
Tracing the main line of Conservative thought and action in America since the eighteenth century, Professor Guttman shows how it has declined in political life while continuing in literature. 42s net

A History of South India
from Prehistoric Times to the Fall of Vijayanagar
K. A. NILAKANTA SASTRI
A general survey of the ancient history of South India to the middle of the seventeenth century. The third edition includes many minor alterations made in the light of new historical evidence. Third edition 2 plates (1 in colour) 30s net

The Managed Economy
MICHAEL D. REAGAN
The author evaluates the American economic world—who really controls it, for what ends, and how this control can be channelled to serve the country's needs. Paper covers. 11s 6d net

The Sociological Imagination
C. WRIGHT MILLS
A detailed and sharp defence of the tradition of classical sociological analysis. Paper covers. 11s 6d net

Tojo: The Last Banzai
COURTNEY BROWNE
An unprejudiced study of Hideki Tojo, the Axis leader, that throws a brilliant light on the man himself and on the Japan of his time. Written by a long-term English student (and resident) of Japan, it draws on personal sources of Tojo family history. illus. November 23rd 30s.

The Far Side of the Sky
NASH WILLIAMS
A superb adventure set in the highlands of New Guinea, where there are still tense frontiers between civilization and the stone age. November 9th 25s.

Morrison of Peking
ERIL PEARL
A biography of the famous Times correspondent who reported a crucial chapter in Chinese history, from the Boxer revolt to the birth of the republic. Twenty intimate glimpses of the politics and London life in the Edwardian era. illus. November 23rd 30s.

Advanced Tennis
PAUL METZLER
Without making it all sound easy, Paul Metzler has written a tennis book that will lift the game of every player who reads it. Wonderfully instructive and entertaining. "Lew. Nov. 23rd 21s.

Angus and Robertson

DEBATES IN ECONOMIC HISTORY
General Editor: Peter Mathias
The rapid pace of change in the study of economic history in recent years has meant that new interpretations of main issues, and much research, have appeared in periodicals rather than books. The purpose of this series is to make such scattered, and sometimes inaccessible material readily available. Each volume contains six or eight contributions to a particular debate, reprinted in extenso, together with a substantial critical introduction and detailed bibliography.

THE CAUSES OF THE INDUSTRIAL REVOLUTION IN ENGLAND
Edited by R. M. Hartwell
University Paperback 25s

AGRICULTURE AND ECONOMIC GROWTH IN ENGLAND 1650-1815
Edited by E. L. Jones
University Paperback 15s

Coming In 1968: THE GROWTH OF ENGLISH OVERSEAS TRADE IN THE SEVENTEENTH AND EIGHTEENTH CENTURIES
Edited by W. E. Minchinton
University Paperback 25s

CRISIS AND CHANGE IN THE VENETIAN ECONOMY
Edited by B. S. Pullan
University Paperback 15s

G. R. ELTON The Practice of History
"It will be seen that Mr. Elton strikes out right and left. I feel lucky to have escaped myself with only a slight, glancing blow. But this is an important book." Hugh Trevor-Roper, *The Sunday Times*
Sydney University Press 25s

METHUEN

NOT A STYLE, BUT A HUE

ALSTE HORN-ONCKEN: *Über das Schickliche*. Studien zur Geschichte der Architekturtheorie. 164pp. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht. DM. 30.
ROBERT ROSENBLUM: *Transformations in Late Eighteenth Century Art*. 203pp. 215 illustrations. Princeton University Press. London: Oxford University Press. 4s.

Vitruvius is a most difficult writer to come to terms with. His literary style is as murky as that of most recent German or American writers on architecture, he does not keep to his own terminology, and he shifts meanings without ever noticing. Yet he has remained fascinating from Alberti to our own day. A sign of this unabated fascination is Frau Dr. Alste Horn-Oncken's learned book on the meaning of *decor* in Vitruvius. The book is exemplary of its kind, but in the end leaves the reader with little that has made the effort of studying these packed pages worthwhile. The book is called *Über das Schickliche* and, as further volumes are promised, shall no doubt later on provide enlightenment on the terms "convenience" and "propriety", as they are used in classic French architectural theory from the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries and on to Pugin's celebrated first sentence of *The True Principles*.

Dr. Horn-Oncken's own original interest is in fact this end and climax of the story; otherwise her introductory chapter would not have been devoted to Goethe on *Das Schickliche* (not that Goethe is terminologically much more consistent or rewarding than Vitruvius). Moreover, she has written only one book before this one, the classic monograph on Friedrich Gilly, Prussia's architectural genius of the end of the eighteenth century who died at the age of twenty-eight in 1800. The book, a model of its kind, came out in 1935 and, side by side with the late Ernst Kaufmann's *Von Ledoux bis Le Corbusier* (Vienna 1933), initiated the investigation of late eighteenth-century neo-classicism. These two books, it is true, had been preceded by monographs on German architects such as Erdmannsdorff and Weinbrenner, but nothing of systematic value had been published with the one exception of Dr. Giedion's brilliant thesis on Baroque and Romantic Classicism (Munich 1922). Giedion's thesis, by now familiar and underlying, for instance, the relevant pages of Professor Pevsner's *Outline*, is that classicism is not a style, let alone the style of about 1800, but a "hue", as he calls it, first of the ending Baroque, then of the Romantic movement.

Professor Robert Rosenblum in a new, suggestive and erudite book translates hue as "coloration", which is neither quite right nor elegant, and it is a pity that in many places he expresses himself in Americanese. The "burning volition" of J. L. David's, Donatello's and Masaccio's heroes is hardly a happy phrase, and "violent weather conditions" on the Külli, when Fuseli's Swiss swear their oath, is rather flat; but these are very minor blemishes and there are few of them.

Professor Rosenblum's book is called *Transformations in Late Eighteenth Century Art*. Though the word neo-classicism is not in the title it is never out of the book. In fact the very first paragraphs of the prologue read as follows:

In art, as in history, the late eighteenth century has generally been divided into the two presumably antagonistic categories of Neoclassicism and Romanticism, a black-and-white polarity that, in more refined histories, also permits a single shade of grey called Romantic Classicism. What are we to call these strange new emotions we feel welling in so much late eighteenth century art, if not Romanticism? What are we to call that abundance of works newly inspired by Greco-Roman art, history, and mythology, if not Neoclassicism? Yet indispensable as they seem to remain for simple communication, these two unequal categories—one referring more to feeling, the other more to form and subject matter—are pitifully inadequate in analyzing the bewildering new variety of emotions, styles, and iconography that emerged in the late eighteenth century.

These lines, apart from showing how well Professor Rosenblum can write, prove that he is aware of the stylistic and terminological problems posed by his period. Yet he shies from offering final answers and indeed from attempts at pulling together the discrepant manifestations of which he is so comprehensively aware. Instead he is content with presenting them, one after the other.

The book consists of four chapters, or more correctly four essays. The first is called "Some Problems of Definition" and deals with certain types of neo-classical art, the Neo-Classical Horrific, the Neo-Classical Rocco-Erotic, including Canova whom Mario Praz once called the Erotic Frigidairer, the Neo-Classical Archaeologic, the Neo-Classical Stole, and then, only loosely connected, Deathbed Scenes, classical (e.g. Thomas Banks's "Death of Germanicus"), medieval (e.g. Brenet's "Death of du Guesclin"), Renaissance (e.g. Ménageot's "Death of Leonardo da Vinci"—as early as 1781) and more recent, and Disconsolate Widows ditto—for all of which many almost unknown examples are assembled. However, a definition does not result from these pages; in fact hardly more than a confirmation of Dr. Giedion's "Classicism is not a style, classicism is a hue".

The second essay does not help the reader in this respect. It is called "The Exemplum Virtutis" and follows through the various hues such themes as the Prodigal Son, Hallé's and Delacroix's "Justice of Trajan", Brenet's "Continence of Scipio", Dummeau's "Continence of Bayard" (chevalier sans peur et sans reproche), Dancé's "Death of Virginia", David's "Death of Socrates", David's "Oath of the Horatii", Chodowiecki's "Les Adieux de Cains", and so to David's "Death of Marat", Gros's "Napoleon in the Plague Hospital at Jaffa" and even Holman Hunt's "Awakening Conscience".

The examples, as will have been noticed, are predominantly French, and this is indeed a limitation of Professor Rosenblum's book. Of the 215 works illustrated about 125 are French, about fifty English, about twenty-five German and about twenty-five from all other countries. It is not parochial to wish that Britain had been more strongly represented, especially for the time before 1800, as Professor Rosenblum knows himself that in novel themes and novel attitudes England during those decades was ahead of France. In fact Leighton, in a brilliant paper in *La Renaissance de l'Art français*, had already said as much in 1922. However, we should be the last to grumble; for most of the French material is virtually unknown over here. The most illuminating part of this essay is that in which it is shown how the same type of *exemplum virtutis* is first, in personages or implied application, transferred from Antiquity to the Revolution, then to Napoleon, and then to the returned Bourbons, until with Delacroix and Manet scenes lose their virtuous connotations.

With this essay Professor Rosenblum moves into architecture, where he is just as much at home as in painting and sculpture. His primary endeavour is to document primitivism from the preference for the squat Greek Doric column over the slender column used by the Romans, the Renaissance and the Baroque—the columns in the Swedish painter Ehrensvärd's picture illustrated in Professor Rosenblum's book must be the squattest ever—to the elementary geometry of the megalomaniac designs of Boullée and Ledoux and the combinations of Greek temples or temple fronts with artificial or natural rocks. The change under Napoleon, back from the primeval to the Roman Imperial, is duly stressed at the end of the essay, but primitivism remains Professor Rosenblum's predominant theme to the end of the book.

The last essay is in fact the best. It is developed from Professor Rosenblum's unpublished thesis of 1956, and its central figure is Flaxman who has never before been analysed so intensively and to such good purpose. The elimination of anything but outlines, the rigid flattening of the compositions, the surrealist mixing of scales, the lure of abstraction are all discussed. One small but characteristic point not commented on by Professor Rosenblum is the use of pre-Periclean sculpture in the illustrations to Aeschylus's *Suppliants*. On the other hand, Flaxman's followers are followed internationally, including David Pierre Giotino Humbert de Superville, that uncanny Netherlander whose allegory of Fear points forward unmistakably to Gatuyn's "Spirit of the Dead watching".

Humbert de Superville's Christian name Giotino will be noticed, and Professor Rosenblum indeed proceeds to examine the influence of the Italian Primitives on the artists of his period, from the interesting parallel drawn by d'Hancarville as early as 1766 between the artists of the Greek vase and "Cimèbe, André Tici Giotto" and from Pätz's *Maestri* of 1774, to William Young's plates of 1790s (though published only in 1826) to Carsten's admiration for Ghiberti, Masaccio and Ghirlandajo in 1792 and to both David and Goethe's mention of Italian Primitives side by side with Polygnotus.

At the end of this immensely stimulating book we seem to be left with the art about 1800, an interpretation which cannot be fully accepted. The sentence in which he sums up to the effect that "the profound transformation of the late eighteenth century left a legacy of disturbing, unresolvable dreams, including the dream of *tabula rasa*" if Professor Rosenblum never succeeds in pulling together all the strands of which he is so fully aware and in making us see the manifestations of the arts about 1800 or between 1760 and 1830 as belonging to one style, however generalized in its characteristics, it may be due to personal propensity, else to a surfeit of knowledge. The bibliographical references in his notes are prodigious. This reviewer would challenge any fellow student of the period not to have found plenty of articles registered with plenty of works illustrated which were new to him. As *unfamiliar* as the book is superb. A pity this is not.

HOUSE STYLES

IAN GRANT (Editor): *Great Interiors*. Preface by Cecil Beaton. Photographs by Edwin Smith. 288pp. Weldonfeld and Nicolson. 45s. up to December 31. £6 6s. thereafter.

To satisfy the fastidious taste of the scholar—which in the long run must matter if standards of perfection are to be maintained—the art picture book need merely fulfil two elementary conditions. First, the illustrations should be most carefully correlated with the text. Secondly, the text, being necessarily limited in length, should not attempt detailed treatment of the subject. Does *Great Interiors* fulfil these two conditions? Not entirely.

All the same, Mr. Cecil Beaton's preface is full of wisdom for he is preaching what he has often practised. When he comes to the art in which he excels, namely photography, we listen with respect to his warnings, of which one is to eschew gimmicks when photographing architecture. This pitfall is not always avoided by Mr. Edwin Smith, who indulges a tendency to over-emphasize foreground detail. His photographs are of course splendid, and the *raison d'être* of this book. But they are not well related to the text; and, worse still, several are so closely juxtaposed in the page as to cause horrid confusions in the eye of the beholder.

In a short Introduction Mr. Ian Grant claims that the book is a search for three unities in interiors, namely overall architectural composition, scheme of furnishing and application of colour. But a good editor should also strive for a certain uniformity of treatment in his authors' contributions, and an avoidance of overlapping. (Charles Cameron and Art Nouveau are dealt with twice in different chapters).

Mr. Ralph Dutton in "Early Classical" Mr. Terence Davis in "Neoclassicism" and Mr. Peter Flewelling in "Romantic Revival" make the mistake of dealing with their subjects country by country. The result is that their chapters, crammed with data, make difficult reading. Their cataloguing method also invites mistakes, and risks some dubious truths. Mr. Dutton exaggerates in stating that "the style of Hugo Jones" found favour with the few who were bold enough to build or embellish their country houses during the Commonwealth. What about Peter Mill's artisan-mannerist style at Thorpe Hall, Balls Park, Tyne hanger and the greater number of houses built for the Commonwealth men? And Mr. Dutton should know—for Mr. Girouard has lately told us—that at Dyrham Park Tabin built only the east front, the western work of a Frenchman called Samuel Hauduroy. Mr. Davis too over-dogmatic in affirming that the "influences of the late eighteenth century" were not architects but "the artists". On the contrary Vanvitelli turned thoroughly neo-classical in his old age and Piranesi was never anything else. Both were extremely prolific builders in that style. So too indeed was Valadier before as well as after 1800.

The most rewarding chapters are Mr. Dany's Hinton's on "High Victorian" and Mr. Ashby Barker's on "Fin-de-Siècle". It is true these are contributors are not re-treading well-worn themes. Neither is their the contrary written readable essays, propounding some novel theories which stimulate the curiosity for further research. Mr. Barker's theory that more travel and less permanence were the root causes of the decline of great domestic interiors between 1880 and 1920 cannot be gainsaid. Mr. Furneaux-Jordan's "Modern" makes a gallant but convincing defence of the shift from private to public patronage in art as aesthetic achievement in general. The hall at St. Catherine's College, Oxford (1960-64) is probably for its "sophisticated quality" wholly appropriate for an establishment of learning. The walls and concrete ceiling are indeed so austere as to be positively daunting. We must well question how far learning and environment really benefit from such blunt sophistication, which makes interiors in exactly the effect of exteriors. Whatever be that, undergraduates may be clearly for interior decorators is clearly for the brand of utilitarianism they will have to shut up together.

IN CAMERA

JEAN-PIERRE ATTAL: *L'Antagoniste*. 266pp. Paris: Gallimard. 15fr.

L'Antagoniste will confuse anyone who still thinks that a "poetic" novel should be swarming with metaphors, even if many of them do seem to have been tried in like fertilizer as the author was reading his proofs. M. Attal has published as much poetry as fiction and his novel is poetic not at the level of its intensity of expression but at that of its organization.

It is offered as a *roman-scénario*, divided into five episodes, to match the five acts of a classical tragedy. All except the middle one are subdivided into sequences, the total number of which in each episode is a different multiple of three. Finally, the sequences themselves are marked off into numerous "shots", involving camera directions and, at times, the association of vision from sound. Yet *L'Antagoniste* is not a shooting script in search of a producer. It is a novel that draws attention to the primacy of fictional construction by incorporating an imaginary camera between the fiction and the reader. It all happens at a controlled distance.

The actual images out of which M. Attal's *modish bricolage* has assembled his novel are second-hand, some more recognizably so than others. There are bits and pieces of old myths, but many more bits and pieces of aggressively new ones—gangsters, business and a police investigation to give a sort of continuity. There is a very attractive divergence too between the jazzy visual images and the portentous dialogue of the characters. And when French mathematics, made or shortened, as is the case with a number of foreign languages, the really keen reader of *L'Antagoniste* could spend happy hours elucidating all its disguises. It has great charm and comic elements.

DEADLY FRIENDS

JAKOV LIND: *Ergo*. Translated by Ralph Mannheim. 126pp. Methuen. 21s.

"There is a plague called man", announced the cheerless epigraph of Jakob Lind's first novel, *Landscape in Concrete*. In *Ergo*, which is no more philanthropic than Lind's previous works, man is "a connecting pipe between rough and garbage pail". The book is set in Vienna, a town "which calls itself the seat of the accident and has sucked nothing but madness". The two main characters are Wacholder, a customs officer who is an enormous penis, and Würz, who lives behind sound-proof and bullet-proof glass. The two men are twins, friends, deadly enemies: Würz, says Wacholder, is "half my mutilated soul".

Würz gave up the world outside seventeen years ago and now never leaves his spotless, hygienic house. He sees "man's job as to tame nature. ('The freedom of chaos is nature in its original state, the freedom of chaos is decay and death. The jungle we have to clear away is freedom.') He is devoting his life to civilizing "a corner of this jungle, a two-storey house in a secluded street".

NO MORE PARADES

DAVID WALDER: *The Fair Ladies of Salamanca*. 266pp. Hutchinson. 30s.

Mr. Walder, who has already shown that he has a gift for comedy, takes things on the whole more seriously in his new novel. He studies the peacetime army, its exercises, its parades, its nail-biting, its waiting about, and its anxieties over the inevitable redundancy problems. The far-flung empire shrinks and the number of far-flung soldiers has to keep in step and shrink as well.

His central character is Major Jamie Barclay of the 9th Dragoon Guards, who are shortly to be amalgamated with the 10th. Barclay, a competent soldier, a little too young to have known active service between 1939 and 1945, has good prospects of avoiding relegation to Civvy Street. Is General Syrett? And daughter of the Colonel of the regiment, doesn't the Colonel of the regiment, Nigel Paterson, an odd, inscrutable person, think highly of him?

But then Barclay suffers a series of unlucky accidents. In addition he has on his hands an extra-marital sexual adventure which for no very obvious reason he finds it impossible

Noël Coward
Bon Voyage and Other Stories 25s

Not Yet the
Dodo and Other Verses 25s

Erle Stanley
Gardner
The Case of the Blonde Bonanza 18s

Robert Lewis
Michel, Michel
"A great and moving novel of the destiny of a child... superbly dramatised in the best documentary style... a superb story."—*The Bookman*, Dec. 4 35s

David Frost &
Antony Jay
To England With Love
"I should be surprised if the book didn't delight most of its English readers."—*Giles Playfair, Sunday Telegraph*. Published jointly with Hodder & Stoughton 25s

Ian Turner
Sydney's Burning
The incredible story of the trial in Sydney, during the First World War, of twelve "Wobblers", members of the anti-war organization Industrial Workers of the World. Illustrated Nov. 27 63s

Osmar White
Time Now, Time Before
The author has recreated with remarkable clarity six extraordinary episodes of life in south-east Asia and the south Pacific between 1949 and 1963. 42s

Vincent Brome
Freud and His Early Circle
An illuminating study of Freud and the early pioneers of psychoanalysis. Mr. Brome examines Freud's business and personal relationships with Adler, Stekel, Rank and Ferenczi; and, in particular, the breach with Jung. 63s

H. Montgomery
Hyde
Lord Reading
The Life and Times of Rufus Isaacs, First Marquess of Reading
"The best book that Mr Montgomery Hyde has yet produced."—*Dingle Foot*, 63s
Sunday Times

Dodie Smith
The Starlight Barking
The sequel to *The Hundred and One Dalmatians* 18s

Helen
Oxenbury
Numbers of Things
Illustrated Nov. 27 12s 8d

Francis Brett
Young
My Brother Jonathan 35s

Gerald Kersh
The Song of the Flea
They Die With Their Boots Clean 30s 25s

Arthur Upfield
Bony and the Mouse 25s Nov. 27
The Widows of Broome 25s Nov. 27

Aesop's
Fables
Illustrated by Arthur Rackham 30s

HEINEMANN

THE CONTRADICTIONS OF SOCIALISM

ÉLIE HALÉVY: *The Era of Tyrannies. Essays on Socialism and War.* Translated by R. K. Webb. 247pp. Allen Lane: The Penguin Press. 12s.

The publication in an excellent English translation of this collection of essays by one of the most distinguished of modern historians is greatly to be welcomed. Although the earliest essay dates from 1907 and the latest from 1936 (one year before Halévy's death), they are all "contemporary" in the sense that they deal with problems that are as live as ever. They represent, moreover, the product of a mind endowed with the gift of prophecy, as well as with astonishingly acute powers of historical and ideological analysis. What Halévy has to say is as important for the student of contemporary politics as for the historian.

The longest and most scholarly of the essays is that which analyses Saint-Simonism and traces its influence on political thought and action during the nineteenth century and beyond. Halévy rightly brushes aside the foolish excesses of the Saint-Simonian "religion" and concentrates on exposing the essence of a politico-economic theory which, although marred by vagueness and full of internal contradictions, has stood up remarkably well to the test of time. Once disregarded, or categorized among the more eccentric of the "Utopian" predecessors of Karl Marx, the Saint-Simonians are currently enjoying something of a vogue, particularly among the sociologists. They certainly deserve this belated tribute; for, as Halévy wrote, although their over-optimism led the Saint-Simonians to cry in proclaiming the imminent end of all war and all revolution, at least they defined with remarkable insight the new forms of the system of production would take in the modern world; and, without desiring them, they predicted the forms social antagonisms would take in the new world that was growing up around them.

It is difficult to imagine that anyone will greatly improve on Halévy's careful and objective analysis of their doctrine and of the subtly pervasive, if rarely overt, influence that it has exerted.

Four essays on the labour movement in Britain are more in the nature of occasional pieces, but of greater interest to the non-specialist than the magisterial treatise on the Saint-Simonians. Halévy, whose knowledge of nineteenth and twentieth-century English history was, of course, unrivalled, had occasion to study, by first-hand observation as well as by documentary research, the Whitley Council movement, which was regarded by its sponsors as the most hopeful path to industrial peace in the strike-racked England of 1918-21. Exceptionally well-informed about British labour and trade union politics, he unerringly exposed the internal contradictions of Whitleyism and predicted that it would fail in its objectives. He also saw that Whitleyism's radical *alter ego*, Guild Socialism, could be no more than a flash in the pan.

The most powerful leaders of the Labour Party and the trade unions, although constitutionalist to the core, had cast themselves in an oppositional role (hence their all-dressed-up-and-nowhere-to-go dilemma when they had to form a government in 1924), while the quasi-revolutionaries who gathered around the Guild Socialist and Syndicalist banners had neither the strength nor the capability to counter the brilliant tactical opportunism of Lloyd George, and hence failed to take advantage of the very brief period during which the tide of events seemed to be flowing in their favour. But, most important of all, the workers themselves were not really anxious to participate in industrial management. "What interests the workers deeply," wrote Halévy, "is not industrial management but wages, or, in more general terms, the conditions of labour." From the vantage point of 1921 he predicted: "the feeling of that whole great propaganda movement for worker control because it does not correspond to the deep needs of the proletariat in the industrial industry." He was, of course, quite right.

The perspective displayed in these essays on the British labour movement is to inform the three lectures Halévy gave at the University of

Oxford in 1929, under the title of "The World Crisis of 1914-18, an Interpretation". But here we have something much more than mere perspective—a wide sweep of historical generalization, in the grand manner. He was delivering these lectures at a time when many of his fellow-historians were busily burrowing into the diplomatic origins of the First World War, in an attempt to assess the balance of responsibility for its outbreak. The only general interpretation that offered itself, to be generally rejected, was the Marxist one, according to which the war was an inevitable product of the clash between rival capitalist imperialisms. Halévy had little interest in diplomatic origins, and was sure that the Marxist interpretation (which in these days was usually expounded in a very crude form) failed to fit the facts. Boldly, he offered a substitute of his own. "The basis of history," he said, "is idealistic not materialistic; and idealism makes revolutions and wars."

For him, the crisis of which the war was incomparably the most violent expression (a crisis which he regarded as beginning with the first Balkan War of 1912 and—quite falsely—as ending in August, 1920) was the product of two powerful "collective forces", nationalism and socialism, apparently hostile to one another but in reality complementary. Such an interpretation is familiar enough to us today, with our experience of "National Socialism", but it was all very new to Halévy's Oxford audience in 1929. His exposition of it has all the simplicity of true originality. If, when treading comparatively unfamiliar ground, he makes a few errors of fact, such as the predating of Gandhi's non-violent resistance campaign in India, it is of little consequence; for an interpretation of this breadth cannot be falsified by an occasional carelessness with dates.

The theme of these lectures is continued and expanded in "The Era of Tyrannies", which gives its title to the whole collection. This consists of Halévy's contributions to a collection organized in 1936 by the Société Française de Philosophie. It is of interest, therefore, as his last word on a subject to which he had devoted so much thought. In his first, lapidary statement he put his cards on the table thus:

Since its beginnings, in the early years of the nineteenth century, socialism has suffered from an internal contradiction. On the one hand, its partisans often present it as the outcome and fulfilment of the Revolution of 1789; a revolution of liberty, a liberation from the last remaining subjection after all the others have been destroyed: the subjection of labour by capital. But, on the other hand, it is also a reaction against individualism and liberalism; it proposes a new compulsory organization in place of the outworn institutions destroyed by the Revolution.

It is the second aspect of socialism that, for Halévy, has become the significant one; for the "era of tyrannies", dating from August, 1914, has displayed the following "socialist" features:

(a) In the economic sphere, greatly extended state control of all the means of production, distribution and exchange;—and, at the same time, an attempt by governments to help them in implementing this state control—hence syndicalism and corporatism along with *étatism*. (b) In the intellectual sphere, state control of thought, in two forms: one positive, that is, the suppression of all expressions of opinion deemed unfavourable to the national interest; the other, negative, through what we shall call the organization of enthusiasm. Thus he jumps together both Communism and Fascism, dates their origin from the beginnings of the First World War, and tends to ascribe both to the transformation, by a kind of Hegelian trick, of socialist ambitions for political and social liberation into their opposite—an unpopular line to take in 1936, and one for which he was strongly criticized by his fellow-participants in the symposium. Even today, when we know so much more about the uses and abuses of "socialist" ideologies, his thesis is difficult to sustain as it stands. As a liberal, he saw the face of the "socialist" bogey in every non-conservative dictatorship, regime, and he clearly underestimated the possi-

bilities of democratic socialism, partly as a result of his contempt, which his austere and measured manner does not always succeed in concealing, for many of the democratic socialist leaders he knew. Moreover, his determination to give the key role in modern history to the First World War (which was fully understandable) caused him to miss much of what was genuinely new (and particularly horrible) in Stalinism and Hitlerism. Nevertheless, his views, although unpopular, probably had more to justify them in 1936 than they have today; and his expression of them is full of the real insights that inform the whole of his work.

It is clear that, in spite of the variety of subject in this collection of essays, it has a unity both of method and of theme. The method is dialectical, although neither Hegelian nor Marxist in inspiration. As the translator, Professor R. K. Webb, writes in his preface, "He could cut through successive layers of conceptions until he came to what seemed to him the core of the doctrine or the historical situation he was trying to expound. There, at the core, he would almost always find a contradiction, and around that contradiction he would organize his exposition and criticism. Whether his subject was Utilitarianism or classical political economy or the social structure of early nineteenth century England, whether it was

socialism in a sect or socialism as a party-long movement, whether it was a trade union or a Whitley Council, something of the quality of his analysis is still possible to discern, but one cannot fail to respect a scholar that has been arrived at with almost rigorous and complete consistency. The theme is the inherent contradiction in socialist doctrine and practice—contradictions which are made plain by the censorious thought which in his long essay on Saint-Simonism he has so ably brought to light. Sometimes off-the-cuff remarks about modern tyrannies. Perhaps he was over-disposed to discover such contradictions. Yet, despite his avowed dislike of what he thought to be bourgeois sequences, his expositions of the doctrine itself sound curiously sympathetic. This is partly due to his own objectivity, and partly to his recognition (explicitly stated in one of his contributions to the "Era of Tyrannies" discussion) that, but for certain accidental factors in his own life, he himself might have been a socialist. As it was, he, a liberal who shared none of the characteristics of socialist optimism about man's political future, achieved an understanding of socialism which—despite some fairly obvious blind spots—was probably unequalled by any recent historian of comparable stature.



Routledge & Kegan Paul
68-74, Carter Lane, London EC4

Announcing a New Series

READINGS IN POLITICS AND SOCIETY

General Editor: BERNARD CRICK

Professor of Political Theory and Institutions, University of Sheffield

This series is designed to introduce students to selected modern problems through the study of sources and contemporary documents. The readings will be drawn from the greatest possible variety of sources: Royal Commission reports, Parliamentary debates, letters to the Press, and other published or unpublished material. The series, as a whole, will emphasize the need to teach the social sciences in an historical context. Each volume carries an Introduction by the volume editor.

Now available

Church and State in Britain since 1820

DAVID NICHOLLS

Lecturer in Politics, University of the West Indies

A selection of documents on the problems of Church-State relations in Britain. The theoretical approach is represented by such writers as Coleridge, Thomas Arnold and T. S. Eliot; the concrete problems and their contemporary solutions are shown in political pamphlets and speeches by leading publicists including Gladstone, Asquith and Lloyd George. 35s paper 18s

Forthcoming titles include

Social and Political Ideas of the British Labour Party since 1900

F. BEALEY, University of Aberdeen

The Rise of Party

A. J. BEATTIE, London School of Economics

The British Ruling Class

W. L. GUTTMANN, University of East Anglia

Modern American Political and Social Thought

EDMUND IONS, University of York

The Rise of the Welfare State

MAURICE BRUCE, University of Sheffield

Revolution

J. K. KUMAR, University of Kent

The Growth and Reform of Local Government

WILLIAM THORNHILL, University of Sheffield

The Growth of the Cabinet System

JOHN MACKINTOSH, M.P.

HARRAP Books for November & December

HANS HABE'S

moving and disturbing new novel

CHRISTOPHER & HIS FATHER

A powerful novel of contemporary Germany by the author of *The Mission, Ilona*, etc. Just published 25s.

RODNEY QUEST'S

topical Service novel

THE FENTON AFFAIR

Deals with the dramatic conflict of personalities in a nuclear submarine establishment. By the author of *Countdown to Doomsday*, etc. Just published 25s.

EDWARD BROWN'S

ingenious thriller

VANDERSLEY

A story involving blackmail, murder, espionage and a family curse. Just published 21s.

JOHN FARRIMOND'S

new mining novel

NO FRIDAY IN THE WEEK

By the author of *The Hollow Shell, Pick and Run*. 21s. (Dec. 7)

PHILIP MCCUTCHAN'S

POULTER'S PASSAGE

A sombre picture of the ruthless men who control international espionage from the author of *A Time for Survival*, etc. "A disturbing thriller."—*Evening Standard*. 18s. 6d.

HARRAP'S STANDARD GERMAN & ENGLISH DICTIONARY

Part I: German-English/Volume 2 (F-K)

Edited by TREVOR JONES

The second volume of this great companion work to *Harrap's Standard French and English Dictionary*.

11½" x 8½"

625pp.

100s.

Adventures in search of the Nature of Man

BETWEEN HEAVEN & EARTH

GORDON ADAMS & PETER ANDREAS

An authoritative account of telepathy, clairvoyance, precognition, teleportation, and ESP. Just published 21s.

ENGLISH MONASTICISM

YESTERDAY & TODAY

E. K. MILLIKEN, M.A.

A fully illustrated survey of the development of English monasticism for readers of all religious faiths. 18s. (Dec. 11)

Classical Studies

NOT AS OTHER MEN

N. SHERWIN-WHITE: *Racial Prejudice in Imperial Rome*. 107pp. Cambridge University Press. 25s.
MAY MACMULLEN: *Enemies of the Roman Order. Treason, Unrest, and Alienation in the Empire*. 370pp. Harvard University Press. London: Oxford University Press. £2 10s.

MacMullen thanked his gods that the Romans were not as other men were in much of the West at least, for he gave them the chance of almost rigorous and complete consistency in their own civilisation. The theme is the inherent contradiction in socialist doctrine and practice—contradictions which are made plain by the censorious thought which in his long essay on Saint-Simonism he has so ably brought to light. Sometimes off-the-cuff remarks about modern tyrannies. Perhaps he was over-disposed to discover such contradictions. Yet, despite his avowed dislike of what he thought to be bourgeois sequences, his expositions of the doctrine itself sound curiously sympathetic. This is partly due to his own objectivity, and partly to his recognition (explicitly stated in one of his contributions to the "Era of Tyrannies" discussion) that, but for certain accidental factors in his own life, he himself might have been a socialist. As it was, he, a liberal who shared none of the characteristics of socialist optimism about man's political future, achieved an understanding of socialism which—despite some fairly obvious blind spots—was probably unequalled by any recent historian of comparable stature.

From the Roman point of view the Jews were unsatisfactory in that they could not be turned out in the Roman mould; they were soft material which would not set; they were not tough; they were too quick to half when they thought and talked, if you wanted your children, if you fell down and broke your arm, if you wanted a fine building designed, you had to call in a Jew. They were *Graeculi*, and Mr. Sherwin-White assured the Cambridge audience to whom his Gray lectures were delivered, "Graeculi the Latin for wog". It is not, of course, nothing like. Some decades ago one might have said in England that it was the word for "Frog". The Romans objected to northern Gauls (and Britons too). Mr. Sherwin-White suggests, because they were big and because of Gallic trousers, which were as objectionable as are today to those who do not love the Scots: After a sympathetic start (for it was the Jews, after all, who extricated Julius Caesar from his predicament in Alexandria), the Romans (as also the Greeks) did not like the Jews.

Strabo (who, of course, was not a Roman) Julius Caesar (who might not have accepted Mr. Sherwin-White's interpretation of some of the things he wrote), Juvenal (always a dangerous author to use), Lucian: Mr. Sherwin-White juggles cleverly with the things that they wrote. But how universal were these prejudices, and how deep? How significant is today a Milanese speaks with disparagement of a Roman, or a Roman of Sicilians as Beavis, Suracens and Arabs?

There are three points of major in-

terest in Mr. Sherwin-White's book: the suggestion that Tacitus did not write the *Germania*, which he will presumably argue elsewhere on more substantial grounds; the suggestion that, on the basis of surviving inscriptions, always slightly dangerous evidence, northern Gauls, despite a promising start, failed to take their proper part in Roman administration, perhaps for lack of *respublica* (a suggestion in which Mr. Sherwin-White follows Professor Ronald Syme); and thirdly, the suggestion that Greeks, on the other hand, did make good second-class administrators, did in fact fill jobs from Romans, perhaps even from Juvenal himself. Hence Juvenal's prejudice.

Mr. MacMullen, in a far more substantial book (and one which, incidentally, will give no joy to Marxist historians), continues his earlier investigations into the disintegration under the Empire not only of loyalty to the state but also of that culture which Rome at first spread, believing it to be the very basis of civilized life. The early emperors were threatened by a section of the governing class itself, disciples of Cato and Brutus, men of breeding who talked of Freedom and since Cato had made suicide fashionable, had suicide in reserve as their last protest: *ambitiosa mors*. They gathered in cliques, were often related, their opposition having at first a literary, then a philosophic tinge. They dreamed of republicanism, liberty, government by the best man (who, as Aristotle could have told them, is never very easy to find). Nothing came of it all but their self-immolation in *nullum in republica usum*. Nerva "reconciled the principate and Liberty", and the egotist Pliny addressed Trajan in public: "Bid us be free; we will." This was the new freedom (or its substitute), *obsequium*, available to one and all in the world as it was. But a genre of protest-literature spread in a very different stratum of society, Jewish, Alexandrian, Christian Acts of the Martyrs, in which the "martyr", judged by the Establishment a rebel, powerless to avoid execution, yet triumphed in verbal repartee against the Inquisition, perhaps against the Emperor in person. He always had the last word: *ambitiosa mors*.

In a more general field not only orthodox education (the liberal arts, which Seneca despised) but also "the mind itself from the second century on came under increasingly open, angry and exasperated attack". Re-

vealed philosophy was the thing. "Unintelligible studies, clever treatises on arithmetic, music and geometry" were denounced, and the way was open to superstition, astrology, magic, demonology. "As time went on, all doubters disappeared. A universal darkness prevailed." Except for the demons, none of this was altogether new. The recognition of magic was as old as the Twelve Tables, and public concern with portents was a confirmed feature of Roman religious orthodoxy. The Establishment fumbled in unsuccessful attempts to control it all; no love philtres; no use of magic for murder; no consultation of astrologers except in public before witnesses, and no inquiries about the Emperor's own horoscope.

Little islands of the old culture survived here and there, but in general emperors and their top servants in the administration were more and more peripheral, no less superstitious than smaller men, wholly absorbed in confronting an unending succession of crises, with no time to cultivate, or interest in cultivating, the classical culture which their upbringing had denied them. For Rostovtzeff the conclusion was all pessimism: "Is it possible to extend a higher civilization to the lower classes without debasing its standard and diluting its quality to the vanishing point? Is not every civilization bound to decay as soon as it begins to penetrate the masses?"

Mr. MacMullen, however, sees as an accompaniment to this decline (the decline of a civilization which was best at home in cities) a form of emancipation. All over the Empire native languages, which among the country-dwellers Latin and Greek had never replaced, emerged into a new respectability. Tatian wrote in Syriac and laid the foundation stone of Syriac literature. "In Egypt a single alphabet was developed for the Egyptian language, an achievement of immense general importance, though intended chiefly for the service of the Church." Christianity elaborated a new system of social justice. In art there was a Celtic Renaissance and even at the centre of things there were new conceptions, visible in the arch of Constantine and portraits of Diocletian, with which we are on the threshold of Byzantine and medieval art. The barbarian settlers brought their own contaminated culture. "The story of how the emperor's subjects were gradually turned into his enemies and mingled with them and ate and talked and dressed like them has still to be written." The evidence is chiefly archaeological. Mr. MacMullen must write it.

TULLY'S OFFICES

Cicero on Moral Obligation. A new translation of Cicero's *De Officiis*, with introduction and notes by John Higginbotham. 214pp. Faber and Faber. 30s.

It is surprising and shocking that Cicero's prose style should evaporate in translation: it is not after all such a serious thing. The crispness and balance of the rhythms, the alcoholic energy of Cicero's diction, have been so diluted and so imitated that one would think they might haunt one's language. But, the tendencies of modern English seem to be in polar opposition to the specific genius of Cicero: "We have gone through the long process of discovery, experimentation, exaggeration, naturalization, variation, and finally, repugnance; there is no classical style in modern English prose and no agreed standard; normal academic English is an unvariable style which is steadily getting worse."

Mr. Higginbotham's translation of Cicero's *De Officiis* prompts these reflections. It is in one sense completely acceptable and admirable, and in the same time unbearably and

inadequate. It is a translation of a duty to humanity as a whole, and consider how human society exists on many different levels. Among man's closest bonds . . . Do you hear it as the voice of one of the greatest stylists in history? Surely a translation, even from the classics, and of all people from Cicero, ought, if possible, to add something to the English language, and at least not depress native rhythms? Mr. Higginbotham is lively in a way, but with a dull liveliness that brings out the worst, not the best, in his original.

It may be that this translation, which is intended for classical background courses and presumably for Latinless readers, has aimed only at a sober competence: the notes are informative and the introduction is excellent within its limits. *De Officiis* is not the most inspired even of the philosophic works of Cicero; it is strictly philosophical, and its interest is almost confined to a few of its earliest chapters, and its medieval and nineteenth-century popularity was due to

its bizarre proliferation of cases for moral casuistry, some of which still appeared in standard Roman Catholic textbooks of that subject until the subject began to dissolve a few years ago. Presumably it is among this material that classical background courses are going to burrow. Surely the choice is unwise since one can learn so much more about Roman values and life from the Roman lives of Plutarch, which have been brilliantly translated in North's version, revised first by Dryden and then by A. H. Clough, and so infinitely much more from Horace. One could learn more from a selection of Cicero's letters, and far more painlessly; but the rather jejune quality of the *De Officiis* thickens through anything less than a sharply good translation to an atmosphere of boredom and dust. There are surely some purposes which Mr. Higginbotham's book will serve perfectly, but even to think of them makes one extremely glad not to be a schoolboy or an undergraduate.

Places and Buildings
SITES ON SICILY

MARGARET GUIDO: *Sicily: An Archaeological Guide*. 219pp. Faber and Faber. 30s.

To those whose main memories of Sicily are now forty or more years old this book will be a revelation, first in its description of the improved hotels and communications which have made Sicily so much easier for the traveller, and secondly in its account of the archaeological sites, which reveal how their visible remains have been revolutionized in scope by the immense amount of excavation and reconstruction that has taken place, mainly in the past twenty years. Mrs. Guido makes it clear that in Sicily today travellers enjoy a degree of comfort unknown in the 1920s, except in a few places, such as Palermo, Taormina and Syracuse, and that the remains of the prehistoric and classical periods, with which alone Mrs. Guido concerns herself, are infinitely more prolific and widespread than those formerly available even to the most determined wanderer beyond the beaten track.

The main tourist sites of former years—Syracuse, Segesta, Selinunte, Agrigento, Taormina and Gela—are still pre-eminent; but they have been joined by a number of newly excavated ones—the Aeolian Islands, Morgantina, Piazza Armerina—that must not nowadays be omitted by anyone who wishes to see all the best ancient remains in Sicily.

Mrs. Guido's book, the first volume in a new series of archaeological guides edited by Dr. Glyn Daniel, is ably conceived and lucidly written, with just enough historical and geographical background to inform the traveller without wearying him, and is notably free from padding and those purple patches which abound in so many popular guide books. Anyone who goes to Sicily would do well to bring it with him; those who go with archaeological intent will find it an indispensable companion. The main sites, as one

BORDER COUNTY

Peableshire: *An Inventory of the Ancient Monuments*. Volumes I and II. 391pp. 143 plates. HMSO. £10 10s. the set.

A particularly heavy responsibility lies on the royal commission on the ancient and historical monuments of Scotland. There are no Penguin or Murray guides, *Country Life* looks at Scotland only a few times each year, and apart from scattered articles and the Antiquaries' *Proceedings* the number of books which have really advanced the state of architectural knowledge since Macgibbon and Ross published their last volume in 1897 can be counted on one's fingers. Now, four years after Stirlingshire, comes Peableshire, a small county of only fourteen parishes. It is disquietingly slow progress: one thinks of Argyll (where they are working now) with thirty-nine, Aberdeenshire with sixty-three and Perthshire with seventy-six, and wonders what will be left to record by the time they get there. The new volumes maintain the high standard of search, description, documentation and illustration set by Stirlingshire. If they are less spectacular it is because Peableshire is not architecturally rich. Careful perusal will show that the commission is becoming ever more comprehensive in its recording.

It is in prehistoric remains, particularly hill forts and settlements, that the county is richest. The introduction excepted, the whole of the first volume is devoted to them, an immense feat of fieldwork, for many have been identified for the first time. Few excavations have been done in the past, and the commission have been able to do only a limited number, the results of the most successful of which, together with the important discovery of the Agrigean fort at Easter Haprew, have already appeared in the *Antiquaries' Proceedings*. Although they have reached some important conclusions and published a valuable series of plans, the full fruit of their work will lie in future excavation.

The county may not be architecturally rich but the second volume in its wealth of research, photographs and drawings makes the most of what there is; and if more criticized it is only because the realms of ascertainable fact are so much greater. There are few churches of note. The very ruined Cross Kirk, the grotesquely "restored" St. Andrew's Tower (both at Peebles), and the church at Stobo, radically altered internally, are almost the sole survivals from medieval times; the mid-

India and Pakistan
COW AND COMPUTER

DAVID STARK MURRAY: *India—Which Century?* 185pp. Gollancz. 30s.

When Aneurin Bevan died the late Lord Nehru established a memorial in his name to help keep the link with the spirit and the ideas of that ardent reformer. Dr. Stark Murray was the first Memorial Fellow and toured the sub-continent under the auspices of the Indian Government for six months in 1965-66. He made his findings known to the Ministry of Education and Directorate of Health—but "India is too big a country, and its problems too complex, to be contained in any official report."

Dr. Murray found himself in a quandary beyond his brief, and in this book attempts a survey of the main problems that inhibit India's advancement into western man's idea of the twentieth century. These are problems of caste, language barriers, religious prejudice and superstition, the gap between the peasant and the educated class, an inherited top-heavy bureaucracy, and fear of what automation might mean to an industrial complex that has as yet scarcely found its feet on a primary level of sophistication.

Dr. Murray is a sympathetic observer and one may fancy that his official reports have been both comprehensive and outspoken, welcome ammunition for the ministers concerned if they share the Nehru ideal of a secular, socialist, democratic state whose future lies in catching up with the west.

Where his book fails, perhaps, is in giving fuller, more explicit, recognition to the fact that the Indian social revolution, unlike that upon which it is based, has been imposed from above. It is an extraordinary, perhaps unique, reversal of the revolutionary process—an attempted imposition of the will of a small enlightened upper-class minority on a vast, relatively or wholly uneducated majority, among whom are to be found an increasingly vocal and expansive middle-class who see the Constitution as a blue-print for continuing western domination.

Dr. Murray expresses somewhat plained disapproval whenever he comes up against evidence of this kind of Hindu reincarnation, e.g., money milked from modern health services to finance Ayurvedic practice and research, consultation of astrologers by a surgeon to fix the auspicious date for an operation. And, of course, fundamentally, he is right—although a Harley Street man while scrubbing up and an astronaut during count down might both say a silent prayer without earning a rebuke from anyone, and Ayurvedic medicine is not the only potentially controversial subject of government expenditure we can think of. The success or failure of the Indian social revolution, as Nehru saw it, must depend upon the gradual infiltration of modern attitudes from above, but there would seem little to be gained by inflexibility and impatience. A huge thrust upwards will sweep away old and outworn traditions. In India there is no such thrust. That is the major problem and Dr. Murray is certainly aware of it even if he sometimes gives the impression of blaming the Indians for its absence. It is interesting to note the paternalistic streak that has emerged in the western socialist attitude to the old imperial possession.

One can hardly blame those Indians who seek an Indian solution. But that is a problem, too. There are, so it would seem, so many kinds of Indian. The unity influence of a Congress Party mightily opposed to British rule has gone; the influence of an educated upper class bent on harnessing the country to western development is a poor substitute, psychologically; and in a psychological context the enlistment of western advice and expertise can act too easily as an irritant if the expert succumbs to the temptation to make value judgments. Odd as it may be to us who would hardly expect to see the lion lie down with the lamb, many Indians see no reason why the cow should not do so with the computer. It is for them to say, to prove or disprove—preferably, from our own point of view, by democratic means.

IF BRITAIN JOINS . . .

THE SIGNING OF THE TREATY OF ROME IN 1959 AROUSED LITTLE INTEREST IN INDIA. THERE WAS A TENDENCY TO CHARACTERIZE THE NEWLY-BORN E.E.C. AS A "RICH MAN'S CLUB", BUT THE GENERAL VIEW WAS THAT ITS IMPACT ON INDIA'S PATTERN OF FOREIGN TRADE COULD BE MORE THAN MARGINAL. WHEN, HOWEVER, THE BRITISH GOVERNMENT SIGNIFIED ITS INTENTION OF JOINING THE COMMON MARKET, IF SUITABLE TERMS COULD BE ARRANGED, INDIA, LIKE OTHER COMMONWEALTH COUNTRIES, BEGAN TO EXPRESS CONCERN. IT WAS RECOGNIZED THAT, WHATEVER SPECIFIC CONDITIONS MIGHT BE NEGOTIATED, BRITAIN'S ADHESION WAS BOUND TO HAVE AN UNSETTLING EFFECT ON INDIA'S EXPORTS AND THAT, IN VIEW OF HER UNSOUND BALANCE OF PAYMENTS SITUATION, THIS COULD BE OF MUCH MORE THAN MARGINAL IMPORTANCE.

INDIAN LAW

H. M. SEERVAI: *Constitutional Law of India*. 1,119pp. Bombay: N. M. Tripathi. Rs.60.

This prospect stimulated the Indian Council of World Affairs to establish a study group of fifteen persons to investigate the economic and political implications for India of the E.E.C. Wisely, they persuaded the Reserve Bank of India to lend them Dr. Dharma Kumar, one of the country's most competent younger economists, as director of the project. This lucid and well-informed book, completed in December, 1965, is the result of their efforts.

On the effect of E.E.C. without Britain, on India's foreign trade, her conclusions are cautious. Up to 1965, it had had "little perceptible impact", and her guess is that it is not likely to make "trading conditions much more difficult for India than they would have been in its absence", at least in the short run. To the extent, however, that India's exports consist increasingly of manufactures, "the customs union may well divert a substantial amount of trade from India to Community suppliers, since the Common External Tariff is high on a wide range of manufactures, including textiles".

The Advocate General of Bombay has modelled this admirable book on Dr. Wynne's classical commentary on the Australian constitution. It differs from the many existing commentaries covering the same subject because it does not treat of the constitution article by article, but dividing the contents of this great document into logical categories, deals with each in turn.

Most legal practitioners in India—let alone law-students—do not possess well-equipped libraries of textbooks and law reports. Even the Indian law reports are not always readily available; it is not easy to get access to the English law reports; the United States Supreme Court reports can be consulted only in the Bar libraries of the Supreme Court and of the High Courts. Mr. Seervai clearly realizes this difficulty; and the method of treatment which he has adopted allows him to set out the facts of cases far more fully than is usual in a textbook, and to indicate in footnotes the point involved in the cases cited. In consequence, he has written a book which is unusually self-contained. No one can read it without acquiring both an adequate grasp of the legal aspects of the Indian constitution and a clear understanding of the effect upon those aspects of the later amendments and of the successive judgments of the Supreme Court. Regarding certain of these judgments—for example, the narrowly divided finding in *I. C. Golak Nath v. State of Punjab*, the author has his own criticisms. Very much to the point is his exposition of the dangers of importing political, economic and social concepts into the task of constitutional interpretation—a caution which the Indian higher judiciary seem sometimes to need. This is an excellent book, a credit both to its author and to the general standard of learning which the Indian legal profession may find just cause for pride.

A Great Painter of Our Time



OTTO NIEMEYER-HOLSTEIN

This pictorial tome with excellent reproductions is the first full presentation of the artist's works. A large collection of tables is preceded by an introduction to follow up the artist's life and creative phases.

Edited by Rudolf Mayer
212 pages, 136 illustrations, among them 40 multi-colour, cloth, MDN 58,--

Bestellen Sie bitte bei Ihrem Buchhändler oder direkt beim Verlag.

Henschelverlag
KUNST UND GESELLSCHAFT 104 BERLIN
German Democratic Republic

WHOLLY ATHENIAN

KEVIN ANDREWS: *Cities of the World: Athens*. 102pp. Phoenix House. 21s.

Anyone who opens this latest volume in the "Cities of the World" series expecting a conventional gush of sunny cultural platitudes about Pericles, democracy, and Doric architecture, will get the shock of his life. Mr. Andrews, an expatriate scholar-traveller who has been around Athens for nearly twenty years, shares something of the Greek's own schizophrenic iconoclasm when discussing his chosen home. Like the traditional Irishman, he is for ever beating his nurse hardest when he loves her best, and about the only rose-tinted view of Athens he is ever likely to take is through a glass of *kokkinelli* straight from the barrel.

Again and again he expresses, in one bright and savage sentence, feelings that many visitors must have hastily thrust down before they could take articulate shape. On the very first page he sums up Plindar's violet-crowned city as "a highly active boom-town, but with nothing (it would seem) volcanic either in the jellied relic of the past or in the anonymous concrete waffle solidifying round it, as far as the eye can see." With gay impartiality he moves down romantic tourists and bureaucratic provincialism, the restored Stoa of Attalus and the Kolonaki bourgeoisie, all in one splendid, swiftly executed holocaust.

Yet when the clouds of sentimentality have been rudely dispersed, something far more real and enduring is revealed. The city's medieval and modern history springs to life in a few brief, brilliantly impressionistic paragraphs. There can seldom have been a better description in English of Athens' pulsating and multifarious back-street life—or indeed of the paradoxical, stubborn, idiosyncratic Athenian character. Mr. Andrews may pulverize bad architecture and neon strip-lighting and all the hideous fringe benefits of the tourist trade; but the *genius loci* has his heart in thrall as much as the next man's.

He writes superbly, with a crystalline clarity and poetic concentration which never spill over into mere rococo exuberance, and a sensuous delight in physical minutiae that recalls MacNeice at his observant best. His knowledge is vast and recon-dite, yet never oppressive; what others would expand to a chapter, he distils in a phrase. He can range in mood from the grim horrors of war-time Athens to the comic bedlam of the Monastiraki flea-market. To borrow the useful distinction publicized by Mr. Patrick Leigh-Fermor, he is "much more Roman than Hellenic"; which may be why—despite his swinging, diatribes—one national daily gave him an enthusiastic full-page spread on publication, an ironic

WATER-DIVIDING

ALAN ARTHUR MICHEL: *The Indus Rivers. A Study of the Effects of Partition*. 595pp. Yale University Press. £4 10s.

Professor Michel's impressive volume is scholarship on the grand scale—a fine example of the contribution which American savants, with great resources at their disposal, are making to the elucidation of Asian problems. The author has displayed remarkable perspicience in dealing both with the technical problems involved in dividing between two new countries a system of irrigation planned to be administered as a homogeneous unit, and with the human passions which at every turn complicated their solution. In approaching this formidable task, he has supplemented his own investigations on the spot by talking to almost everyone who had a hand in shaping the final outcome—engineers, bankers, politicians, statesmen, soldiers, administrators. He has given the most lucid account so far to appear in print of the difficulties under which Lord (Sir Cyril) Radcliffe, who was then, was working—difficulties which are the inevitable explanation of the inconsistency between the principles followed in the *Frontiers award* and the failure to apply them to Gujarat. Even if the *Frontiers award* gave India land-access to the sea, Pakistan should, on the same principle, have received at least some bargaining power in the matter of water resources.

This is one of many examples of Professor Michel's careful and impartial handling of matters that are still charged with political dynamite. The specialist reader may perhaps detect one or two gaps in the list of the written material which the author has consulted. But more is how in the case of Pakistan. Can he be relied upon to give an impartial account of the difficulties which have arisen since the partition? Can he afford to ignore the modern facade can afford to ignore

Encyclopedia of
LIBRARY AND INFORMATION SCIENCE

The title of the Encyclopedia reveals its aim, intent, and motivating prejudice. The title also underscores a firm belief that a new science has grown out of traditional librarianship as incorporated with the most recent discoveries of vast amounts of information.

The problem of organizing knowledge has been a matter of serious concern for centuries. The library traditionally has performed the function of acquiring, organizing, storing, and disseminating the record of previously generated information which represents the foundation of society's knowledge. As the growing volume of recorded information began to strain seriously the traditional library science tools, a divergent strain of documentation and information science developed, with its own set of tools and techniques. Unfortunately, the two fields overlapped only superficially even though the two areas tend to emerge from a common problem.

This twelve-volume Encyclopedia is the first complete and authoritative work on the subject, combining both theory and practice in the United States and abroad and every opportunity will be taken to display the common roots and problem solutions. A thirty-two member international advisory board of prominent librarians and information scientists has been formed for this purpose.

ALLEN KENT
HAROLD LANCOUR
Editors

- The Encyclopedia presents tools from which both fields can benefit.
- Contributors are internationally known experts in the fields.
- Appropriate illustrations and tables are included.
- All subjects are arranged in simple alphabetical array.
- Cross references are provided as appropriate.
- Bibliographies are given where appropriate.
- A detailed index will appear in the last volume.

Volume 1 to be published June 1968
price \$14 (approx.)
Orders to PAUL KOSTON Bookseller
42 Newman Street London W1

Nineteenth Century

SIR GARNET TO THE RESCUE

In Relief of Gordon. Lord Wolseley's Campaign Journal of the Khartoum Relief Expedition, 1884-1885. Edited by Adrian Preston. 267pp. Hutchinson. £2 10s.

BYRON FARWELL: Prisoners of the Mahdi. 356pp. Longmans. £2 10s.

Lord Wolseley's autobiography—*The Story of a Soldier's Life*—ended in 1884 when this uninhibited diary begins. It was almost certainly designed to provide material for another autobiographical volume, which Wolseley lacked the heart to publish after the failure to rescue Gordon had blasted and poisoned his career. Extracts from the diary were incorporated by Sir Frederick Maurice and Sir George Arthur in their *Life of Lord Wolseley* (1924), and the manuscript subsequently disappeared as a result of a family dispute. It was not used by Mr. Julian Symonds when writing *England's Pride: The Story of the Gordon Relief Expedition* (1965); and its disinterment by Mr. Adrian Preston, who teaches at the Royal Military College, Kingston, Ontario, is most welcome.

Much the greatest part of Wolseley's day by day account of the campaign which he commanded is printed now for the first time. It has been admirably edited by Mr. Preston, whose bracing introduction could scarcely be bettered; and it constitutes an artless, vivid and authentic self-portrait. Its human and personal interest rivals that of Gordon's *Khartoum Journals*, and professional historians will find it useful at this late hour.

Wolseley was unduly diffident about his ability to write. He noted that although "I love to be made to

laugh, and have a strong sense of the comic and ridiculous. . . I become ponderous and pompous. . . I cannot touch a subject lightly." He drew, nevertheless, upon an inexhaustible vein of sour humour, laced with cynicism and uncharitableness; and he expressed extremely forthright opinions.

An Irish soldier of fortune who had displayed initiative and reckless daring on innumerable occasions, Wolseley had risen the hard way. Contemptuous of those who owed their promotions to birth or mere seniority, he wore an arrogant public mask which made enemies. He enjoyed especially, for example, making fun of the Duke of Cambridge "with his great square fat bottom to his fire in the Horse Guards", who "has always evinced the hatred towards me which is born of jealousy and begotten of spite". He considered that H.R.H. lacked "the first necessary quality of a soldier, namely physical courage, a peculiarity which his eldest son has unfortunately inherited."

Wolseley's radicalism did not spare Queen Victoria, although he noted that "if required I would die for Her". But he denounced the English gentry as drones.

In order to keep up high rents to enable the landed proprietors to send his wife and daughter to London for the Season and to Paris in the Autumn, it was necessary to keep down the labourers' wages to the lowest possible rate. Generations of badly paid men develop bad citizens. The landlord and the farmer divided the spoil of the land between them, whilst the poor devil who tilled the ground was fain to live upon the crumbs that fell from the rich man's table.

Upon returning in 1884 to Egypt, which he had conquered two years earlier, Wolseley for once felt ill at ease. He asked the Government vainly and unhelpfully for a clear ruling about the risks which he ought to accept in the Sudan, noted smugly that "my request is on record", and dreamed sometimes that he heard the newboys yelling in Pall Mall: "Defeat and death of Lord Wolseley!" It is remarkable, however,

that his diary betrays no awareness of even the possibility that he was personally responsible for having induced the Cabinet to endorse a fundamentally unsound strategic plan.

The highest military, naval, intelligence and engineering authorities in Whitehall and in Cairo had recommended unanimously that an advance from Suakin, on the Red Sea coast, to Berber, above the Nile's fifth cataract, offered much the best and most speedy prospect of relieving Khartoum. But Wolseley had delisted that advice. He importunately insisted upon advancing the whole way up the Nile with the aid of specially constructed boats, and the Cabinet, whose ignorance of strategy often provoked Wolseley's mirth, had weakly agreed.

Forbidden by the War Office to push his headquarters beyond Korti, the Commander-in-Chief was constrained for the first time in his life to direct from a distance the decisive operations of his forces, instead of leading them in person. "Men talk", he noted, "of the strain sometimes experienced in great danger. Well, I can speak of that from personal experience better than most men, but having led storming parties, I can assert them to be child's play compared with the strain which a General situated as I have been for some days past, has to undergo." He found it "almost intolerable", and when, after incurring heavy casualties, he learnt that Khartoum had fallen to the Mahdi and that the relief expedition had failed, he had no idea what to do. He halted his distant columns and wired home for instructions.

Wolseley's diary thereafter is filled with rancid diatribes against Gladstone, "the most contemptible charlatan of our day", whom he accused with some reason of having delayed the start of the campaign. He felt the need, however, of a scapegoat in his power and on the spot, and turned accordingly upon one of his subordinates, Colonel Sir Charles Wilson, whom he charged with having displayed excessive caution. Wolseley dubbed Wilson "one of those nervous, weak, unlucky

creatures" whom "I hate the sight of. . . I have asked that he may be recalled. . . and when he goes, I hope I may never see him again."

Mr. Preston has done well to establish firmly the military reputation of Sir Charles Wilson, whose conduct he rightly describes as "unflinching and courageous". But he is equally fair to Wolseley, whose temperamental and other troubles emerge with clarity from this diary. It presents a convincing, if by no means wholly attractive, self-portrait of an ambitious, stiff, sensitive, proud and overbearing man; and it complements the more localized sketch drawn recently by an American historian, Professor Joseph Lehman, in a sparkling biography, *All Sir Garnet*, published in 1964.

Mr. Byron Farwell's popular history of the Mahdist empire from the fall of Khartoum in 1885 until the conquest of Sudan by Kitchener in 1898 is woven largely round accounts left by three European prisoners of the Mahdi and of his successor, the Khalifa. Their sufferings and adventures recounted throughout Christendom at the end of the last century; but Rudolf Slatin's *Fire and Sword in the Sudan* (1890) is not much read today, while Charles Neufeld's *A Prisoner of the Khalifa* (1899) and Father Joseph Ohrwalder's *Ten Years Captivity in the Mahdi's Camp* (1893) are virtually forgotten.

In comparison with Auschwitz and other Nazi hell camps, Sudanese prisons were civilized and humane. Slatin, in particular, who turned Muslim and displayed a prudent sympathy for the Sudanese, was treated not merely with sympathetic consideration but also with extraordinary generosity. *Prisoners of the Mahdi* makes no claim to comprehensiveness; it ignores events in the outlying parts of the Mahdist empire; and it contains little information that is not available elsewhere. But the background is painted admirably; the book is entertaining; and a number of interesting personalities are brought successfully and vividly to life.

BISMARCK THROUGH QUOTATIONS

LOUIS L. SNYDER: *The Blood and Iron Chancellor. A documentary biography of Otto von Bismarck*. 423pp. D. van Nostrand. £3 12s.

Of all forms of literature, biography, for its successful achievement, demands in the writer an historian's impartial judgment and an artist's intuitive perception of the personality hidden behind the outward appearance of a sitter for a portrait. The biographer must also be constantly mindful of the changing social, political and economic environment that makes up the background to the portrait and must weigh upon the scales of his critical judgment the prejudices both personal and political, and the veracity of the persons whom he calls upon to testify to his subject's character and achievements. And when, as in Professor Snyder's "documentary biography" of Bismarck, his life history is largely told by quotations from the books of some forty previous writers as well as by excerpts from Bismarck's letters, speeches and memoirs, and from Professor Snyder's own writings, the necessity for the author to use his critical faculty and also to afford the reader some information about the reputation and authenticity of these writers becomes of paramount importance.

Professor Snyder's book may cause a general reader to feel that he is compassed by a cloud of witnesses about whom he knows little or nothing. The omission is, however, justified. The biographer's duty is to present the general reader with the specialist's information, not to present the specialist's information. The specialist's information is the domain of the specialist, not the domain of the general reader.

All About Him (published in 1898 in London) and what reliance can be placed upon his tales of Bismarck's high-handed exploits at school and university. Or again, what degree of authenticity attaches to George Bulten's gossipy *Story of Count Bismarck's Life*, which was also published in London obviously before 1871 and Bismarck's elevation to princely rank. And yet again, who wrote *St. Petersburg Gesellschaft*, with its little-tattle about Princess Bismarck which makes a sole appearance here in a footnote without any explanation? It is regrettable that Professor Snyder should have used quotations from such books, as also from Klatsko's malicious *The Two Chancellors—Prince Gortschakoff and Prince Bismarck* (1876) and Jules Hoche's questionable *Bismarck at Home* (1899). In the same volume that contains well-chosen and pertinent accounts of Bismarck by the distinguished American historian and ambassador John Lothrop Motley, who was his close friend for many years, and by recognized authorities such as Erich Eyck, Werner Richter, Erich Marcks and others.

A singular omission too in the case of one of the greatest of diplomats is the absence of quotations from Bismarck's brilliant dispatches and diplomatic instructions which would have shown his conduct of foreign policy. All that Professor Snyder provides are two summaries written by himself of negotiations from 1879 to 1891 between the United States and Germany over the importation of American pork into Germany and the Anglo-French negotiations.

It is in 1880-1885 between England and Germany while there is only the barest mention of Bismarck's greatest diplomatic achievement, the Triple Alliance and the ensuing Re-Insurance Treaty with Russia. Those criticisms might be thought curious if it were not that in his preface Professor Snyder makes the following reaching claim:

Every phase of Bismarck's life has been investigated, and this documentary biography has been fashioned from an almost bewildering wealth of material. In each case (the selection has been made with a view to adding something of interest and of drama to the overall picture) Bismarck is presented with all his faults and blemishes as well as his positive qualities.

Here the significant words are "investigated", which is undoubtedly well-taken throughout; the book is "fashioned", to which too much may have been paid. None the less, Professor Snyder's portrait of Bismarck is a life-like and revealing one. He is a reader may ironically smile, who is told by Professor Snyder that Bismarck "possessed the literary gift of a Disraeli, the gusto of a Flaubert, the split personality of a Hamlet." Of Bismarck the statesman as depicted by Bismarck the man, however, Professor Snyder is inadequate for a full appraisal of his life-work. He is nevertheless making an entertaining periphrasis in a novel "biography" that can better be described as a "biography by quotations" than as a "documentary biography" with its implications of original sources.

A SHORT HISTORY OF ENGLAND. Two generations ago, in the year of the agitation against the so-called "Papal aggression", Carlyle produced his "Latter-Day Pamphlet" entitled "Jesuitism". Mr. Chesterton has now, in the days of Prussian aggression, written a similar pamphlet which might have been called "Protestantism". Four centuries ago the English Parliament, he tells us, "took the side of the Protestants, and then (partly as a consequence) it took the side of the Germans"; but in 1914 "the common crowd of poor and ignorant Englishmen . . . burst through the filthy cobwebs of four hundred years and stood where their fathers stood when they knew that they were Christian men". His book is a spirited attempt to capture in the interests of Catholicism the patriotic passion generated by this war, and the exigencies of pamphlet-writing require the suppression of such facts as that the war was begun by the aggression of the principal Catholic state in Europe, which is now looking to Catholic influence in various quarters to procure a peace which shall protect it from punishment. Coincidence also served Mr. Chesterton's Prussian Protestantism an ill turn when the publication of his pamphlet was followed by the appointment of a Catholic as Chancellor to the Kaiser.

Now Mr. Chesterton very happily inspired when he called his pamphlet a history of England, and justified its appearance on the ground that a history from the standpoint of a member of the public has not been written. "We do not quite know what he means by 'a member of the public', nor why historians are excluded from the category . . .

It would be vain to review this book as a history of England, for it is interesting only as an expression of Mr. Chesterton's mentality and as an illustration of the whimsical visions of the past which appear to the agitator and the agitators. The historian is well aware that he can only see the past through a glass of many colours, but he knows that the business of his science is to dispel, so far as possible, the distortions of the various media through which historical knowledge is transmitted. But to Mr. Chesterton the distortion is the reality; credulity with regard to legends is, he says, more sane than incredulity. The colour in the glass is more important than the light which penetrates the colour . . .

Thus he has much about St. Thomas of Canterbury, but nothing about St. Thomas of Lancaster. The Earl, it is true, was never canonized by the Church, because the Church was not given to canonizing laymen, but he received that popular canonization on which Mr. Chesterton lays so much stress. Miracles were wrought at his tomb, and crowds flocked to worship his effigy in St. Paul's. And this was a man who, according to his biographer, "signally failed to show either patriotism, far-sightedness, or even the more common virtues of a good party leader". If the legendary St. Thomas of Canterbury is the real Becket, what was the real Thomas of Lancaster? To Mr. Chesterton "Arthur is more real than Alfred", and "The Round Table is as Roman as the round arch"; and he seems to be under the impression that the early Britons had read the whole cycle of legend to which Geoffrey of Monmouth gave literary expression, and even Malory's "Morte d'Arthur". We are, he says, "Roman remnants", but omits to explain how Britons who

had been converted into Romans came to speak English and to be ruled by English law.

It is of stuff like this that Mr. Chesterton has set out to re-write English history with a veracity beyond the reach of historians, and to make a picture of medieval England which shall whet the appetite of the modern revolutionist. To Mr. Chesterton the supreme moment in English history occurred in 1381, when Richard II, after Wat Tyler's murder (by a Mayor of London), put himself for the moment at the head of a mob. The mob is Mr. Chesterton's hero, and he outdoes Carlyle in his hero-worship. Consequently, he forgets to mention on this occasion that it slew an Archbishop of Canterbury. He also states that Parliament compelled Richard to revoke the charters he granted the villains, though Richard revoked his charters in July, and Parliament did not meet till November. That Parliament began the ruin of England, which is completed by viking with the Protestants in the sixteenth and with the Germans in the eighteenth century. The only modern statesman who commands the respect of Mr. Chesterton is "the great Bolingbroke", and that is because "his policy made peace with France and broke the connexion with Prussia". Mr. Chesterton is superior to facts and dates, but he is consistent in his legendary view of history; and, just as all he can see in the Becket quarrel is the legend of Chaucer's time, so all he can see in the eighteenth century is his present feeling about the 17th.

FIFTY-YEAR RULE

Extracts from review published anonymously in the TLS on November 22, 1917.

By G. K. CHESTERTON.

that it created a machinery of pardon, where the State could only work with a machinery of punishment". Mr. Chesterton is obviously oblivious of the hundreds of thousands of Royal pardons entered on the Rolls, and also of such engines of punishment as bishops' prisons and ecclesiastical Courts; and by ignoring one half of the activity of the State and the other half of the activity of the Church he can produce a characteristic antithesis which suits his views of history.

Thus he has much about St. Thomas of Canterbury, but nothing about St. Thomas of Lancaster. The Earl, it is true, was never canonized by the Church, because the Church was not given to canonizing laymen, but he received that popular canonization on which Mr. Chesterton lays so much stress. Miracles were wrought at his tomb, and crowds flocked to worship his effigy in St. Paul's. And this was a man who, according to his biographer, "signally failed to show either patriotism, far-sightedness, or even the more common virtues of a good party leader". If the legendary St. Thomas of Canterbury is the real Becket, what was the real Thomas of Lancaster? To Mr. Chesterton "Arthur is more real than Alfred", and "The Round Table is as Roman as the round arch"; and he seems to be under the impression that the early Britons had read the whole cycle of legend to which Geoffrey of Monmouth gave literary expression, and even Malory's "Morte d'Arthur". We are, he says, "Roman remnants", but omits to explain how Britons who

had been converted into Romans came to speak English and to be ruled by English law.

It is of stuff like this that Mr. Chesterton has set out to re-write English history with a veracity beyond the reach of historians, and to make a picture of medieval England which shall whet the appetite of the modern revolutionist. To Mr. Chesterton the supreme moment in English history occurred in 1381, when Richard II, after Wat Tyler's murder (by a Mayor of London), put himself for the moment at the head of a mob. The mob is Mr. Chesterton's hero, and he outdoes Carlyle in his hero-worship. Consequently, he forgets to mention on this occasion that it slew an Archbishop of Canterbury. He also states that Parliament compelled Richard to revoke the charters he granted the villains, though Richard revoked his charters in July, and Parliament did not meet till November. That Parliament began the ruin of England, which is completed by viking with the Protestants in the sixteenth and with the Germans in the eighteenth century. The only modern statesman who commands the respect of Mr. Chesterton is "the great Bolingbroke", and that is because "his policy made peace with France and broke the connexion with Prussia". Mr. Chesterton is superior to facts and dates, but he is consistent in his legendary view of history; and, just as all he can see in the Becket quarrel is the legend of Chaucer's time, so all he can see in the eighteenth century is his present feeling about the 17th.

His other concern is with that "revolution of the rich against the poor" which he thinks Richard II tried in vain to stop by placing himself at the head of Wat Tyler's leaderless mob. "The failure, or rather the betrayal", of that Peasants' Revolt "was the real turning-point of our history"; and, in spite of the reappearance of "the real mob" with the rick-burning and frame-breaking of Cobett's days, Mr. Chesterton can see no escape from the descent into that "servile state" into which our Protestantism and our Prussianism have led us, "but by doing what the medievalists did after their barbarian defeat: beginning, by guilds and small independent groups, gradually to restore the personal property of the poor and the personal freedom of the family." In his revolt against Prussia, Mr. Chesterton throws himself into the arms of M. Lenin and exhibits about as much sanity as his Russian exemplar. It would be unjust to deny the sincerity of his indignation against social wrongs and inequalities, but his "history" is a riot of paradox. He is always standing on his head in order to proclaim that the world is upside down. The habit may have its advantages as an occasional pose; it amuses people, and gives the performer a fresh point of view. But it is well to know that you are standing on your head when you are doing so, and that is where Mr. Chesterton fails. He thinks history is all wrong because he is indifferent to historical truth, and unfamiliar with the ways of finding it.

AM. F. ROLLARD.

Picasso

The Blue and Rose Periods: a Catalogue Raisonné

... a publication of considerable value. In all the thousands of books that have been done on Picasso, this is the first systematic catalogue raisonné of the years 1900 to 1906. The authors' scholarship and patience in hunting up the facts have resulted in a number of important revisions of date and shifts of emphasis—especially in relation to the time Picasso spent at Gósol in the summer of 1906, and its relevance to the development which, in Paris that autumn, was to lead through the African heads and the extraordinary portrait of Gertrude Stein to that barbaric seed-pod of modern art, *Les Femmes d'Alger*.

ROBERT HUGHES in *Studio*

61 colour plates and 770 monochrome reproductions £10 10s

EVELYN, ADAMS AND MACKAY
9 Fitzroy Square, London W1

THE TIMES

ATLAS

OF THE

WORLD

COMPREHENSIVE EDITION

This entirely new volume answers the demand for a manageable one-volume edition of THE TIMES Atlas based on the famous maps of the previous 5-volume Mid-Century Edition, at a price within the reach of the general public.

The maps in this new volume have been redrawn to take account of political changes, and they incorporate the latest geographical information. Our knowledge of the earth's surface has been greatly increased by artificial satellites and other researches, and serious attention is given to this in the preliminary sections of this atlas. New features include sections on the solar system, the galaxies and a magnificent map of the moon, world maps of strategic mineral, food and energy resources.

The Times Atlas in its modernity and detail is indispensable for the understanding of world events.

The Comprehensive Edition of The Times Atlas of the World will shortly be available at 10 gns. Orders may be placed through your booksellers or sent direct, with 7s. 6d. extra for postage and packaging inland, or 30s. abroad (excluding USA and Japan) to The Publications Department, Times Newspapers Ltd., One Abchurch Lane, London, EC4.

Brochure on application.

